SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

14th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XIV, Number 4 P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 March 1, 1984

Science and Secrecy

R&D Security Restrictions Arouse New Fears

An unusually gloomy assessment of the Reagan Administration's policies on freedom of scientific communication is contained in a staff-written report now being circulated from the National Academy of Sciences (NAS).

Based on a review that included top-secret intelligence briefings, it says that the past 18 months have produced no additional data about the alleged "leakage" of American scientific and technological information to the Soviets. Nonetheless, the report states, the Defense Department's hardliners have taken control of the communication issue and, despite consultations that have soothed academic leaders, security interventions are increasing and more are on the way.

These already involve crackdowns on foreign attendance at American scientific meetings and restrictions on publication of unclassified research financed by the Defense Department, plus support for extending Export Administration Regulations to unclassified scientific papers. The newly issued staff report is both an update and an epitaph for the Academy's effort in 1982 to illuminate and discredit claims of Soviet military advantage from the generally open character of university-based science. The published outcome of that 1982 attempt was *Scientific Communication and National Security*, produced by a 19-member blue-ribbon panel laden with establishment industrial technocrats and academic mandarins chaired by Dale Corson, President-emeritus of Cornell University (SGR Vol. XII, No. 17). The new report bears that same title, with the subtitle *The Issues in 1984*. Staff members for the preparation of the earlier report and the updating were Mitchel B. Wallerstein and Lawrence C. McCray, of the Academy's Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy.

Rapid Growth Urged for NSF Engineering Program—Page 7

Focusing mainly on academic science, the 1982 Corson panel concluded that some very limited areas of campus-based research warranted security concern. But, apart from that carefully qualified concession, it insisted that restrictions on communication would inhibit science and thus actually work against national security.

As might be expected, that notion was endorsed by a variety of academic and scientific organizations, plus the DoD-University Forum, a meeting ground for worried university presidents, prominent among them Donald Kennedy of Stanford, and friendly officials in Defense research and engineering. William P. Clark, then the President's National Security Adviser, dozed through an unveiling of the report at a private dinner organized by Academy President Frank Press, progenitor of the Corson effort. But Clark left an impression of sympathy. Presidential Science Adviser George A. Keyworth II displayed a respectful, though noncommit-

(Continued on page 3)

In Brief

Capitol Hill still feels occasional aftershocks from last year's pork-barrel raid on the Department of Energy by lobbyists for Columbia University and the Catholic University of America (SGR Vol. XIII, Nos. 10, 19.) Alluding to that episode, two Republicans on the House Science and Technology Committee, F. James Sensenbrenner (Wis.) and Larry Winn Jr. (Kan.), have introduced a resolution (H. Con. Res. 257) stating that research funds should be awarded "solely on the basis of scientific merit as determined in a fair and open competition by a review of peers . . . "

There's other news, too, on that subject. Schlossberg-Cassidy and Associates, Inc., the Washington lobbying firm that represents Columbia and Catholic universities, has announced appointment of a new staff member: Carl Franklin Godfrery Jr., former Executive Assistant to Speaker of the House Tip O'Neill. It was a word to O'Neill's office from the late Archbishop of Boston that got grants for the two schools in lightning-fast floor action. Widespread resentment has since blocked the awards (SGR Vol. XIV, No. 3), but the final round is yet to be played.

Meanwhile, White House Science Adviser George A. Keyworth II has tempered his customary reverence for peer review with a tart observation about granting procedures at the National Science Foundation. Speaking last week to a Washington meeting of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Keyworth said that NSF has "operated effectively and rather complacently in the peer-review grant process mode. It doesn't stir up very much trouble, it doesn't require very much defending in front of the Congress, and if you think about it, it even bears a certain resemblance to how HHS (Department of Health and Human Services) distributes all their funds."

NSF, Academy Hold Meetings on R&D Controls

At least two closed high-level meetings of Washington-based insiders and colleagues from near and far have been held this year in response to reports that the Administration plans to apply the licensing provisions of the Export Administration Act to unclassified but "sensitive" scientific communications. One was put on by the National Science Foundation, the other by the National Academy of Sciences.

With participants from major research universities, high-tech industry, and government, NSF held a "workshop" on January 25 and 26 to discuss the effects that proposed revisions of the Act might have on research and teaching in epitaxy and lithography (etching techniques for the manufacture of electronic devices.) The meeting was sponsored by NSF's Division of Electrical, Computer, and Systems Engineering and Division of International Programs. Housekeeping arrangements for the meeting were handled by an NSF contractor, SRI International, at a cost of about $20,000.

NSF's letter of invitation stated that draft revisions to the Act, which has been temporarily extended following expiration last year, "seem to have the potential of seriously affecting progress in American science and engineering." The letter noted that "the revised regulations would require a Government license for all 'exports' involving 'critical technical data,' " and stated that "the definition of 'export' includes such things as presentation of papers where foreigners are present or the hiring of a foreign researcher . . ."

Thomas Everhart, Dean of Engineering at Cornell University, served as Chairman of the meeting, which was held in suburban Washington. Among those attending were representatives from the University of Illinois (Chicago Circle), MIT, State University of New York at Buffalo, University of California at San Diego, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Oregon State, and the Association of American Universities.

Also attending were representatives of IBM, Motorola, and Bell Labs. Several observers were present from the Defense Department and the Commerce Department.

The meeting, using background papers that the invitation described as "not generally available outside the government," wasn't publicly announced. According to persons present, many of the participants were distressed by descriptions of the security measures that could be imposed on scientific communication through draft amendments to the Act and its accompanying Export Administration Regulations. One university representative is reported to have estimated that he'd require several hundred licenses.

The Academy's meeting, held February 14, and titled "Export Controls: Reconciling National Objectives," was attended by about 90 persons. These included representatives from some of the 57 firms that have signed up with the Academy Industry Program—a fledgling arrangement under which the Academy provides briefings and other informational services for corporate contributors. (The average contribution is reported to be $20,000 per company.) The firms represented included General Electric, whose Senior Vice President for Corporate R&D, Roland W. Schmitt, a rising star on the Washington science-policy scene, delivered one of the major papers. Among the other companies present were Boeing, Gulf Oil, Atlantic Richfield, Bechtel, Dart Kraft Industries, Hughes Aircraft, and Shell Oil.

Other speakers included Paul Gray, President of MIT; Lionel Olmer, Undersecretary of Commerce for International Trade; John McMahon, Deputy Director of the CIA; and from the Defense Department, Stephen Bryen, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Security Policy, and Edith Martin, Deputy Undersecretary for Research and Advanced Technology.

ISSN 0048-9581

© Science & Government Report, Inc., 1984

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Association Publisher
Wanda J. Reif

Circulation Manager
Margaret E. Lee

Contributing Correspondents
Christopher Joyce (Washington); Francois Seguier (Paris); Ros Herman (London)

Independently published by *Science & Government Report, Inc.*, twice monthly, except in January, July & August. Annual subscription: Institutions, $144.00 (two years, $255.00). Information about bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second-class postage at Washington, D.C. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six months of publication date.

. . . "Much of Initial Hope Has Evaporated"

(Continued from page 1)

tal, attitude toward the Corson analysis and recommendations.

Having done its work, the Corson panel disbanded in what appeared to be a generally favorable atmosphere. As Wallerstein and McCray observe in their post-Corson review, release of the 1982 report was followed by "optimistic expectation on the part of the research community that the troubles that had led originally to the creation of the panel finally might be resolved and a new working accommodation developed." Prospects for repelling the hardliners seemed even better two months later, when the President directed the National Security Council to conduct an interagency review of technology transfer. The Academy then privately prided itself on having "set the agenda"—a consoling role for the politically concerned but politically powerless in Washington.

However, the Wallerstein-McCray updating states that "Much of the initial hope has evaporated," and, amid repeated delays in devising groundrules for technology transfer, "it appears that policymakers in the Defense Department and elsewhere are moving forward to implement new regulations in advance of a consensus on government-wide policy." At the policy-making level, the authors report the following:

- A proposal, reported to be in draft form, to eliminate the current exclusion of "scientific and education data" from regulation under the Export Administration Regulations. "Since the definition of 'export' includes such things as presentation of papers at symposia where foreigners are present, the hiring of a foreign researcher, and so on," Wallerstein and McCray write, "the proposed rules seem to have the potential to have a significant effect on the US scientific enterprise."
- Reports of efforts underway to expand the authority that the Secretary of Defense was given in the 1984 Defense Authorization Act to deny Freedom of Information requests from foreigners seeking certain unclassified technical data in the possession of DoD. Wallerstein and McCray report that "Additional proposals have been circulated within the DoD to seek broader

(Continued on page 4)

Clampdowns on Scientific Meetings Listed in Study

The Academy staff updating of the Corson report lists the following collisions from 1982 on between government security restrictions and unclassified scientific activities—some previouslsy well-publicized, others not so:

- September 1982. Annual International Technical Symposium of the Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers, San Diego. "More than 100 technical papers scheduled to be presented were withdrawn at the request of the Pentagon because they were said to contain 'technical information that could not, by law, be exported to America's adversaries.' Although most of the papers had been approved for presentation at lower levels of the DoD, these clearances were subsequently overruled and papers modified or withdrawn . . ."
- September 1982. Electrical and Aerospace Systems, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE); Electrical Aerospace Conference, Washington, DC. "It is reported that just before the opening of the conference, the Chairman was asked by an Air Force representative to destroy all records, abstracts, and papers and to cancel all presentations of certain papers that were considered to be 'compromising national security.' The Chairman responded that the IEEE would comply if the Air Force would bear the cost (estimated at $25,000-$50,000). A day later the Air Force representative withdrew the request."
- November 1982. IEEE, International Test Conference, Philadelphia. Five days before the Conference (and after abstracts had already been printed), an official of Texas Instruments asked, at the request of the Air Force, that three previously cleared TI papers be withdrawn. Following "adverse publicity," the Air Force again reviewed the papers and cleared them for presentation.
- July 1983. Fourth International Conference on Permafrost, Fairbanks. Prior to the conference, six of 24 papers from the US Army Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory were reported withdrawn without explanation. "Conference organizers were puzzled to see that most of the withdrawn papers concerned topics where the US holds a dubious or non-existent lead over the Soviet Union."
- November 1983. American Vacuum Society, Annual Meeting, Boston. "A week before the conference, an FBI agent had visited the AVS office and requested complimentary badges to permit six agents to attend the meeting under false names." [The request was granted, then revoked.] Following the arrest on espionage charges, unrelated to the meeting, of an East German physicist, Alfred Zehe, who was attending, the FBI asked the Society for a list of the 2600 persons who had attended the meeting "and threatened a subpoena if the list was not supplied." When the Society refused voluntary compliance, "The FBI reportedly chose not to pursue the matter."

. . .Policies Based on Fragmentary Information

(Continued from page 3)

authority to protect sensitive technical data produced by other agencies (eg, NASA, Department of Energy, etc.) by facilitating their transfer to DoD control."

- An internal Defense Department study describes classification of currently unclassified publications "as still a viable option as long as guidelines are produced that define very specifically what elements of a technology are really militarily critical and the operational threshholds beyond which the information should be classified." The Defense study is said to note that "Classification will be a useful approach only if used very judiciously in clearly identified areas and in accordance with the existing Executive Order." The reference is to Executive Order 12356, issued in April 1982, which expanded the range of classifiable material even to the extent of authorizing reclassification of unclassified material.
- The State Department is using visas "for handling cases of individuals suspected of technology acquisition," according to Wallerstein and McCray, and has "indicated that action may now be taken on a visa solely on the basis of the potential for technological loss."
- Today, as was the case two years ago, the authors state, the federal government has not developed a reliable means "for a net assessment of the damage to US national security from losses occurring through open scientific communication . . . .But the fact remains that major changes in US technology transfer policy are being considered and decided on the basis of incomplete—and possibly erroneous—information on the extent and seriousness of the loss of scientific and technological information."

While many of the senior executives of academe and Washington-based university lobbying groups continue to express confidence in the effectiveness of the DoD-University Forum, Wallerstein and McCray express some doubts. And there are those who strongly contend that the Forum—essentially a twice-yearly bull session between a few university presidents and senior civilian R&D brass from the Pentagon—has been out-maneuvered by the right-wing heavies of Defense: Richard Perle, Assistant Secretary for International Security Policy, and his chief henchman, Stephen D. Bryen.

It is noted, for example, that, following deliberations with the Forum, Defense established a Panel on International Technology Transfer—with Perle as Chairman—as a kind of supreme court within DoD for resolving disputes on technology transfer. Also established was a Subpanel on Export Control, chaired by Bryen, and a Subpanel on Research and Development, chaired by Edith Martin, Deputy Undersecretary for Research and Advanced Technology. Bryen, who is tough and fanatical, serves on the Martin panel. Martin is not tough or fanatical.

Distributed around Washington to the press and various sympathetic organizations, such as the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Corson update reflects the Academy's frustration with the security issue and its inability to do anything about it now.

The report bears an uncustomary disclaimer for a document emanting from the venerable, and disciplined, NAS—"The views expressed are those of the authors alone, and do not necessarily reflect the views" of the Academy or its several parts. But it's safe to assume that the Corson updating reveals the concerns and has the blessings of Academy President Frank Press.

The moment and conditions, however, are regarded as poor for an attempt to gather popular and political support for the dimly perceived issue of freedom of scientific communication. The Administration has in-

(Continued on page 5)

Geologists Wait for Funds

Will the American Geological Institute get the customarily routine travel grant that it has requested from the National Science Foundation for AGI members to go Moscow in August for the 27th International Geological Congress?

AGI sources say that when they applied for a grant of $50,000 last April, NSF told them a decision would be delivered in "early January." That's now been put off to mid-March, which is getting a bit tight for seeking other money for the costly trip to Moscow.

Sources at the Foundation tell SGR that their only instruction concerning travel to meetings in the Soviet Union is to judge them exclusively on the basis of "scientific merit." They point out that, despite the current chill in Soviet-American relations, funds have been provided for attendance at meetings in the USSR. And they say that they're not aware of any problems concerning the AGI application. But they don't know what's holding it up. One possibility is that some of AGI's own members have become a factor: Following the Korean airliner catastrophe, a bunch of them advocated a boycott of the Moscow meeting. Meanwhile, the AGI is anxious about the situation. The current issue of *Geotimes* notes that the US National Committee on Geology adopted a resolution in December supporting international cooperation "as required for the continuing health and growth of important international science programs."

Unfilled NSF Posts Queried in Congress

The Administration's unexplained year-plus failure to make full-fledged appointments for five senior positions at the National Science Foundation has been drawing critical, though polite, attention on Capitol Hill.

The appointment lag was raised February 9 at NSF's annual authorization hearing before the House Science and Technology Committee. And it came up again February 22 at the authorization hearing before the Senate Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee.

In both cases, the questioning reflected the committees' sympathetic attitude toward NSF's only remaining Presidential appointee, Director Edward A. Knapp. The subject was merely touched upon, and, following unavoidably lame explanations from Knapp, was mercifully dropped. The reason is that Knapp has come to be regarded as a nice guy who unthinkingly got off to a bad start by dismissing some NSF brass so that he could have his "own team," as he put it upon taking office in November 1982 (SGR Vol. XII, No. 21). He's still waiting—apparently the victim of a White House personnel office that doesn't regard these vacancies as especially important.

The missing appointments, which have caused a great deal of resentment at NSF and in some science-policy circles, were gingerly brought up by Rep. Doug Walgren (D-Pa.), Chairman of the Subcommitee on Science, Research and Technology. Referring to an "organization without managers in place," Walgren added: "I suppose we could pursue the reason why they are not in place, but nonetheless, to assure the public of the best disposition of [the NSF budget], at some point we really have to be able to tell them that the slots have been filled, for fear of being criticized of managing by unfilled slots . . . "

Confronted with the albatross, Knapp replied, "No slots are unfilled. They are filled with people who are acting assistant directors, and I must take this opportunity to say that the people who are in those positions are doing an absolutely superb job of managing in the absence of permanent people, and they are all very knowledgeable federal employes who understand the system extremely well, and I am very pleased with the way it is going."

To Knapp's defense of NSF's acting deputy director and four acting assistant directors, Walgren replied, "You would agree that it would be more desirable for everyone's commitment and morale that these positions be filled with designated persons?"

Knapp said, "Yes, I would agree." And the Subcommittee members then mercifully turned the dialog to other matters.

The vacancies were brought up in the Senate by Slade Gorton (R-Wash.), Chairman of the Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee, at the very beginning of the annual hearing on the authorization bill. Knapp, who publicly conceals weariness at being asked to answer for a matter beyond his control, replied, "I and my staff and the White House are working as hard as we can to fill these vacancies. We have made some progress, and we are expecting some nominations in, I hope, the near future. We are continuing to discuss, with the White House, candidates for some of the other positions which are vacant. I hope to have them filled as quickly as possible."

In regard to Knapp's expectations, NSF officials shrug and point out that they've been down that road before. But, for the record, the word is that FBI checks are being conducted on two candidates who have promised to come aboard—a life scientist and physicist, both from the UC Berekely.

While "acting" appointments fall into a bureaucratic limbo that can be personally unsettling for their occupants, the main issue of concern in this case is the effect on NSF's operations. A large and routinized enterprise, the Foundation, by many accounts, performed without missing a stroke during the transitional months of presidentially appointed officials departing, to be succeed-

(Continued on page 6)

Security

(Continued from page 4)

deed quietly backed off, though perhaps only temporarily, from its grand scheme for wholesale use of lie detectors to identify "leakers." And it has also slunk away from plans for lifelong restrictions on "sensitive" public disclosures by former public officials.

But those designs personally engaged the interests of the press—which welcomes news leaks and now-it-can-be-told insider accounts. Scientific communciation, in contrast, is a noble value, surely worthy of few editorial exhortations, but is not a deeply felt issue in the press or on Capitol Hill. An egregiously offensive case of scientific suffocation would bring forth various champions—opportunistic or heartfelt. But short of that, the Academy has concluded that there isn't much that can be done now to counter the Reaganite designs on freedom of scientific communication.

What it's not willing to confront publicly is that the expanding Defense support now warmly welcomed in academe creates easily grasped opportunities for restrictions on movements of people and information. Resistance to the Pentagon's intrusions on scientific traditions would make more sense politically if it were accompanied by suggestions for routing all that new money for basic research through civilian agencies.—DSG

. . .Bureaucratic Rigidity Setting in at NSF?

(Continued from page 5)

ed—only briefly, it was thought—by acting replacements appointed by Knapp. In short order, he expected, the White House would nominate his "own team" for full-fledged appointments.

Last fall, the approaching first anniversary of Knapp's own nomination didn't bring news of appointments, but it did bring a wave of gossip—still rolling—about bureaucratic rigidities setting in at NSF. Since the Foundation has never been especially nimble in its operations, it is difficult to assess these allegations. But it is perhaps relevant that in science education—a subject of intense general, professional, and political interest—NSF has re-established its education directorate but appears to be having difficulty gearing up to spend relatively modest sums.

Its program of Science Education Research and Educational Materials Development is budgeted in the current fiscal year (1984) for $27.7 million, plus a carryover of $11.4 million in unspent funds from 1983. For 1985, that program is again budgeted for $27.7 million, despite an increase of 13.6 percent in NSF's overall budget—and countless jeremiads about the state of science education. At a press briefing, Knapp was asked about the seemingly leisurely pace of NSF activities in education and other subjects that have been declared neglected and important. He responded to the effect that some things just can't be accelerated.

There's no clear answer to the question of why the White House doesn't fill those NSF posts. It is rumored that Knapp recommended a Presidential appointment for at least one of the NSF staff members now serving on an acting basis, but that the White House—averse as ever to holdovers from the past administration, even in non-political posts—turned it down. It's known that at least some of the acting appointees are understandably resentful about being praised for their performance in posts for which they are not deemed suitable for regular appointments.

In the circumlocutional ritual of presidential appointments—would you say yes if we ask you?—it has been reported that several outside prospects said yes, and then were not asked; or that when asked, the final nod came too late for them to make a convenient departure from current employment.

In any case, it is plain that the White House doesn't assign any great importance to the NSF appointments, for if it did, Presidential blandishments would surely have produced the recruits by now. (It was a phone call from Jimmy Carter that brought Knapp's reluctant predecessor, John B. Slaughter, to the Directorship.)

As was evident from his brief exchanges at the hearings, Knapp does not relish the subject. The committees, which are protective of the Foundation and understanding of Knapp's plight, do not want to irritate a difficult situation by suggesting there's some deficiency in the acting appointments. And everyone realizes that, though the five appointments may be announced tomorrow, spring of an election year is a poor recruiting time, especially in the academic pool that has traditionally provided most of NSF's leadership.

Medical Researcher Joins White House Science Office

In one of its rare recruitments from academe and womankind for a senior staff member, the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) has installed a new Deputy Director to look after the life sciences and related regulatory affairs.

The appointee is Bernadine H. Bulkley, Professor of Medicine and Assistant Dean for Postdoctoral Programs and Faculty Development at the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, and Director of the Coronary Care Unit at Hopkins Hospital. Bulkley is author of some 150 papers, mostly on cardiovacular disease, and is President of the American Federation for Clinical Research. She is a 1970 graduate of Harvard Medical School.

The appointment reinforces OSTP in an area where it has had several comings and goings but little permanence over the past two years. Like his predecessors in the White House advisory post, OSTP Director George A. Keyworth II, a physicist, has observed the tight alliance between Congress and the National Institutes of Health without being able to get into the act. Keyworth has lately been arguing that NIH must put more stress on basic research and biotechnology and less on "disease-of-the month" favorites (SGR Vol. XIV, No. 3).

Following a flock of OSTP staff departures and replacements drawn from government and defense laboratories last year, Keyworth apparently took some pride in an academic recruitment, of which OSTP has had very few. Prior to White House clearance of the appointment, word was passed that it was going to be something special.

Bulkley will be one of two Deputy Directors at OSTP, and the first woman in the Keyworth reign to hold a senior staff post. It's been suggested at OSTP that if things go according to plan, she will be a presidential appointee, rather than merely an appointee of Director Keyworth. In bureaucratic rankings, that sometimes carries advantage.

NSF Urged to Expand New Engineering Program

Under more than the customary pressure to expand support for engineering, the National Science Foundation is now in receipt of potent advice for accelerating its new program for developing interdisciplinary engineering research centers.

NSF has $10 million budgeted for that program for fiscal 1985. No one is quibbling about the start, but a design that far surpasses the Foundation's normal pace of growth is contained in a report that NSF solicited from the National Academy of Engineering. The report was made public at NSF's Senate authorization hearing last week by NAE President Robert M. White, who has been flogging NSF for what he considers inadequate attention to engineering.

Based on the report, prepared by a panel chaired by W. Dale Compton, Vice President-Research, of the Ford Motor Company, White recommended that NSF aim for a goal of 25 centers within five years, each with NSF annual "core" funding of $2.5 million to $5 million, not including stipends or tuition. The centers are intended to complement traditional academic engineering education by providing a setting for collaboration with industry.

The proposal comes at a time when the Reagan Administration is pushing hard for tighter links between industry and academic science and technology. In this context, there's a revival of support for rechristening NSF as the National Science and Engineering Foundation—a move that many of the elders of science have long resisted as a competitive threat to federal support of basic research.

But both times and the membership of the National Science Board, NSF's policymaking body, are changing. The professional categories aren't always clearcut, but it's generally felt that industrial representation has greatly expanded on the 24-member Board in recent years. And in May, when one-third of the six-year appointments routinely expire, appointees of the Reagan Administration will, for the first time, constitute a majority.

The Board is pretty much a busywork operation, forever introspecting about what it might do, without ever doing very much. If the Administration wants an NSEF, it will push for it, with or without the endorsement of the Board. But the process would be tidier if the Board went along.

In Print

The following publications, containing transcripts and background materials from hearings held last year on technology and the economy, are available without charge from the House Science and Technology Committee:

Japanese Technological Advances and Possible United States Responses Using Research Joint Ventures (476 pages);

Research and Development Joint Ventures (182 pages);

Technology and Employment (1397 pages);

Supercomputers (460 pages).

(Send self-addressed label to Committee on Science and Technology, Publications Office, House of Representatives, H-2 108, Washington, DC; tel. 202/225-6275.)

Science and Technology Data Book, a smartly designed, pocketsize NSF-produced condensation of basic statistics about US R&D spending, employment, educational enrolments, etc., plus some international comparisons and bibliography of detailed NSF publications on these subjects.

(51 pages, no charge, NSF, Division of Science Resources Studies, 1800 G St. Nw., Washington, DC 20550 tel. 202/634-4622.)

Corporate 500: The Directorate of Corporate Philanthropy, compiled and published by the Public Management Institute, San Francisco, provides detailed information for applying to this increasingly important sector of research support; included are firms that make direct contributions as well as those that donate through corporate foundations; listings for each includes areas of interest, eligibility for support, programs officers, and application procedures.

(Available in April, about 1000 pages, softbound, $225 prepublication, then $245. Order from Gale Research Co., Book Tower, Detroit, Mich., 48226)

Subcription Form

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription; ☐ Check enclosed
☐ Enter my subscription; ☐ Please bill

Institutional subscribers: one year, $144.00 ☐; two years, $255.00 ☐

(Overseas airmail, $25.00 per year additional.)

Name _____

Address _____

_____ Zip _____

Industrial Commission Issues R&D Suggestions

Eight recommendations concerning research and development, few of them particularly useful, have been endorsed by the President's Commission on Industrial Competitiveness. The Commission, chaired by John Young, President of Hewlett-Packard, was set up last year as part of the Administration's counter to Democratic exploitation of the industrial-policy issue.

One of the recommendations calls for lessening antitrust barriers to joint R&D ventures—a measure deemed unnecessary and of little interest to industry by Mr. Reagan's own appointee to the Chairmanship of the Federal Trade Commission, James C. Miller III.

Another recommendation calls for making permanent the current tax credit for firms that expand R&D spending. Internal studies prepared for the White House by the National Science Foundation say that all the data aren't in, but that apparently tax credits play a very minor part in R&D spending decisions.

Then there's an autonomic assault on the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), which Reaganite devil-theorists see as the source of various misfortunes that are mainly of their own making. In this case, after asserting that "The Commission fully supports the principles of the FOIA," it proceeds to recommend that functioning of the act be gutted by providing companies with notification of and an opportunity to block requests for "commercially sensitive information."

The Commission also calls for patent-term restoration, a pet goal of the pharmaceutical industry, which contends that a large part of the 17-year clock on patents often runs out while new drugs are in the approval mill at the Food and Drug Administration. This has been disputed by various studies, including one by the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment that showed that through advertising and promotional efforts, firms easily continue to dominate major markets following patent expirations.

Other recommendations concern product counterfeiting, foreign infringements on US patents, and establishment of a federally operated central data bank covering "various industrial sectors and different countries."

The Commission's recommendations are to be submitted to the Cabinet Council on Commerce and Trade. But even if the Administration's attention can be engaged in this election year, the ideological flavor of many of the recommendations virtually rules out acceptance by the Democratic House.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid
at Washington, D.C.

XEROX-UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS
300 N. ZEEB RD.
ANN ARBOR, MI 48106